

**To:** Froede, Carl[Froede.Carl@epa.gov]  
**From:** Amoroso, Cathy[/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=C5033745779E4121B626D62341A9B89C-AMOROSO, CATHY]  
**Sent:** Thur 7/1/2021 10:44:54 PM (UTC)  
**Subject:** Re: Today's DRAT Meeting highlights

Thanks for the notes. Much appreciated.

Cathy Amoroso, Chief  
Restoration & DOE Coordination Section  
Superfund & Emergency Management Division  
U.S. EPA, Region 4

On Jul 1, 2021, at 2:51 PM, Froede, Carl <Froede.Carl@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Cathy;

Shelly has a good summary (forthcoming) of today's DRAT mtg.

Randy Young issue:

Randy is concerned that DOE will NOT treat any of the effluent coming out of the EMDF. He wants a DOE commitment that they would treat ALL effluent. DOE said that treatment would be based on the numbers – which have yet to be generated. Randy continued to press but DOE ever agreed to full effluent treatment. Randy is worried that technology cannot reach the RAD effluent levels which creates issues – but he is unwilling to accept “dilution” as the means by which DOE can address the lack of treatment. Sam Pack then spoke up and said that DOE could treat the effluent to whatever levels are necessary.

Eric Abelquist issue:

Eric raised the possibility of piping the effluent out to Poplar Creek or the Clinch River to meet RAD release levels through assimilative capacity. This came up when KJ said that low-flow in Bear Creek would essentially be zero. Don't think he was serious but it was verbalized.

EPA parts of the discussion:

1. I informed the team that EPA (still working on this internally) is looking at directing DOE to incorporate all DRAT activities and products into the revised FFS. Annette stated that the DOE plan was to produce a Technical Memo that would be placed into the Admin Record that would provide the discharge limits in the ROD. Annette's big concern is that the FFS would delay everything by seven months in following the FFA protocol. I told her that EPA's expectation would be that the FFS would run in parallel to the ROD being finalized once all of the DRAT activities and products are completed followed then by ROD signature. Shelly asked Annette and Eric to see if the FFS could be revised to include all of the DRAT work (in its own appendix) and get back to the group.

2. Kerrie-Jo did a good job defending the Clean Water Act “Recreational” stream designation for Bear Creek but she couldn't speak to Wheeler's letter laying out a fisherperson downstream that DOE would designate as the POE. Both Joel and KJ need to read the Wheeler decision letter and talk to you. You can explain what DOE wants to do. They still cannot speak directly to DOE's POE issue as presented in Wheeler's letter and it winds up a mutual stalemate. KJ clearly explain the “TN Recreational Use Designation” for the entirety of Bear Creek and why it would be treated as one unit – not allowing for dilution or a “mixing zone.” DOE still believes the Wheeler letter allows them to use a dilution/mixing zone. Sam Scheffler/Shelly asked KJ to see if she can get EPA legal approval to share the calculations that she worked up for you. They want to see the numbers.

Those are the issues discussed at today's meeting. Connie was on the call (thanks Connie) and she may have other issues she could add to those I present above.

Overall it was a productive meeting with no hostilities expressed.

FYI,

Carl